


SPEECHES
♦ ♦
LINCOLN DINNER
FEBRUARY 12, 1916

SPEECHES
delivered at the
LINCOLN DINNER
of the
REPUBLICAN CLUB
of UTICA



Saturday Evening, February 12, 1916
Hotel Utica
Utica, New York



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from

The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

The Lincoln Dinner

WITH an attendance that taxed the capacity of the hostelry, with speeches elevated in tone, having nothing of the claptrap stamp in their composition, with a spirit of harmony that foreboded ill to opponents, the annual Lincoln Day Dinner, held under the auspices of the Utica Republican Club at Hotel Utica on Saturday evening, February 12th, will be regarded as a memorable event in Republican annals. Governor Charles S. Whitman of New York State was present and delivered an address that was notable for its excellence. The other speakers were Jacob Gould Schurman, President of Cornell University, one of the ablest exponents of political questions in the country, and Hon. F. M. Davenport, candidate of the Progressive party in the last gubernatorial election, who officially returned to the party, which he regards as the best instrument for public service in the future. All the speakers were accorded exceptionally cordial greetings. The addresses were of serious character, each speaker endeavoring to treat his subject on its merits, without regard to political effect. Democrats could have listened without offense, for the discussion, in the main, was lifted above partisanship. In the formal addresses practically the only criticism of the opposition was contained in the observations of President Schurman to the Mexican policy of President Wilson. "Preparedness" was the chief topic of all the speakers with the exception of Mr. Davenport, who devoted his address, after a preliminary statement, to the life and character of Abraham Lincoln, whose memory was signally honored by the occasion.

Thomas R. Proctor was the toastmaster, and he performed his duties with that tact, dignity and modesty so characteristic of the man.

The guests began to assemble early, and spent a social time in the lobby awaiting the arrival of the speakers. Soon after 7 o'clock Governor Whitman and his military aide, Captain Spencer, arrived, and the reception committee formed in line and a short reception was held, the entire assemblage improving the opportunity to shake the hands of the Governor and the other speakers. Deputy State Controller Reusswig stood next to the Governor and made the introductions. Meanwhile the St. Vincent Fife and Drum Corps played patriotic selections, and added much to the life of the occasion.

In a short while the diners were seated at the tables, and when the toastmaster and the speakers entered the entire company of 350 men arose, sang and waved American flags. During the service of the banquet, singers under the direction of Prof. John G. Thomas, rendered familiar songs, in which the diners united.

Greetings to Mr. Wheeler

Rapping for order, Toastmaster Proctor opened the speaking part of the program by reading a letter of regret from Thomas Wheeler, who was unable to be present on account of illness, and the audience expressed its appreciation by long continued applause of the sentiments expressed. Earlier in the evening the following greetings had been sent to Mr. Wheeler from the banqueters:

"To the Honorable Thomas Wheeler:

"About to seat ourselves around the festive banquet board, we note with saddened eyes that one best loved and most familiar face is missing. *'The Old Man'* is not here!

"But this feeling of sadness instantly changes to one of gladness and joy in the thought that if not actually present he is with us in spirit; and that the countless deeds of goodness to us, his friends, still abide fresh in our memories.

"So we send to him these bright-hued, sweet-scented flowers and bid them say to him:

"GOOD CHEER! GOOD HEALTH! GOOD LUCK! AND GOD BLESS YOU!"

CHARLES S. WHITMAN
JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN
THOMAS R. PROCTOR
WILLIAM S. DOOLITTLE
C. S. SYMONDS
HARRY W. ROBERTS
M. J. BRAYTON
E. B. ODELL
JOHN C. DILLON
D. F. BREITENSTEIN
C. SAUTTER, JR.
JAMES T. SOMERS
CHARLES WENZEL
DANIEL P. BECKER
ARTHUR O'BRIEN

FREDERICK M. DAVENPORT
FREDERICK T. PROCTOR
CHARLES B. ROGERS
W. I. TABER
W. H. ROBERTS
GEORGE B. ALLEN
F. W. SESSIONS
CHARLES W. WICKS
FRED G. REUSSWIG
HOMER P. SNYDER
TOM W. JOHNSON
F. W. BENSBERG
JOSEPH KUOLT
J. PHIL BANNIGAN

Mr. Wheeler's Message

Mr. Wheeler's letter expressed regret at his inability to be present and concluded with the following injunction to his fellow Republicans:

"Now that the evening of life is setting in for myself and for many others who have borne the brunt of the fight for Republican principles these many years, I send this message to the young men who are now taking up the burden: Be verile and active in upholding the faith and traditions of the grand old party. Never be ashamed of that great party which gave to the world the magnificent character whose memory you are honoring to-night. Continue the splendid record of accomplishment which has been of such benefit to the world and which has been the record of our party since its inception. The beneficial results of Republican rule mark every page of our country's history for the past fifty years and more. Fight for the restoration of that rule in the Nation, and its continuation in the state, county and city. Thus will you honor yourselves and benefit your fellow citizens."

Mr. Proctor's Announcement

Mr. Proctor read a notice of the lecture to be given at the Historical Building Wednesday night and then in an apparently indifferent manner said that the Lawrence house, at the corner of Steuben Park and Rutger street, had been sold and that the purchaser had given it to the Republican Club. It was a minute or two before the audience understood what had been said or comprehended just what had happened. Some time elapsed before order was restored, and then Mr. Proctor proceeded with the program.

The Gettysburg Address

Fittingly giving the proper atmosphere and character to the dinner, Mr. Proctor first read Lincoln's Gettysburg address:

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place

for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

“But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate — we cannot consecrate — we cannot hallow — this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us — that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

Mr. Proctor then spoke briefly as follows:

“On February 12, 1809, there was born into this world a man who was destined to be the leading character of his generation, and we are here to-night to celebrate that event. Others will talk to you of the virtues, the patriotism and achievements of Abraham Lincoln. My duty is simply to introduce the speakers who honor us by their presence, and to whom the thanks of this great company are extended most cordially.”

Speech of Governor Whitman

In a sense, it is not within our power nor is it in the power of the loving millions, who are meeting throughout the United States to-day, to do honor to Abraham Lincoln. The glory of his life and of his martyrdom lift him far above the praise of men, and all that remains for us is the sacred privilege of consecrating ourselves anew to the patriotic tasks that claimed his heart and his soul throughout the days of his earthly existence.

Oratory can add nothing to a life of such perfect simplicity that even the most ignorant and unthinking can grasp its lesson and understand its meaning. If we assemble each year upon the occasion of his birthday, it is not merely to recite how Lincoln lived and thought, but by comparison with the ideals that possessed his mighty spirit and the calm courage that drove him toward his goal, to measure how we ourselves are living and are thinking.

It has been said again and again that Abraham Lincoln stands before the world as a faithful expression of democracy, an exemplar of the type that can be developed by free institutions. Born in poverty, nurtured in adversity, lacking all influence and unblessed by any advantage, he mounted step by step until he stood higher than the Kings of earth, in that his proud eminence came to him through the voice of the people, not the accident of birth.

It is our duty to see that the gates of opportunity are never closed and that as long as the Nation shall live, the humblest may be permitted generous access to the broad way that leads from the gloom of obscurity to the shining heights of achievement. It should be our solicitude to foster the courage, the ambition and the self-reliance that make such ascents possible, for the nation that is without aspiration is a dying nation. Whining, peevish complaints and the note of weak surrender must not be allowed to gain a foothold in American character.

How have we progressed in the tolerance and understanding that are to safeguard us against stupid hates and blind antagonisms? It was not only that Lincoln was called upon to be one of the leading figures — the leading figure perhaps — in the fratricidal strife that bade fair to destroy the world's one great adventure in human liberty; from first to last he was compelled to suffer the abuse of press and people who were without pains to

understand either his motives or his actions. Have we really progressed? Is fairness or fairminded judgment the rule in our country to-day? Is misinterpretation, distortion and misrepresentation of public men and of public questions the rule rather than the exception among certain classes of our people and in some portions of the world of journalism, as was true in the days when a great soul was tortured by calumnies and the harsh judgment of the unthinking and the uninformed?

Honest criticism is one thing and unwarranted attack is another, and habits of cynicism, misunderstanding and hasty condemnation may serve to discourage and embitter public servants and even to destroy their usefulness among our people and may serve, and in some instances I know that they do serve, to keep men out of public service who might otherwise be of tremendous value to the State.

Times do not change as materially as men imagine, and the survey of the crucial periods of the world history, at least in comparatively modern times, will develop a certain marked similarity in fundamentals if not in details. Always and ever, in some form or other, it is freedom that is at stake. Where change is found it is in the manner in which nations and people face these crises.

To-day, as in the dark hours when Abraham Lincoln wrestled with the enemies of liberty and democracy, forces of disintegration are at work, not so obviously, not so boldly, to be sure, but in this very subtlety is an added danger.

As a consequence of the European war, preparedness has become the dominant issue, and out of the prejudices engendered by discussion a very menacing extremism is being developed. Ultra-pacifists and ultra-militarists, more concerned with the success of their propaganda than national welfare, are shattering the noble traditions of the past, tearing away every laurel-wreath and besmirching every monument. It has become a commonplace to charge the devoted men of the Colonies with desertion, indifference and cowardice and to ascribe the winning of American independence to the accident of chance. Balancing this, is the accusation that we have conducted ourselves as bullies, taking advantage of armed strength to prey upon weakness. Were we to judge by the oratory and literature of the day, the United States has been a nation of somewhat weak souls who owe success to favoring fortune rather than to any inherent courage or capacity.

We are told continually that the nations of the earth despise

us, and it seems to be the wish of many that we should govern our national policies with a view to gaining the favor of foreign powers rather than the advancement of our own good and the perpetuation of our own institutions.

Of a piece with this reprehensible extravagance is the hysteria that sees a potential traitor in every citizen of foreign birth. It would be unnatural, indeed, if those who come to us from other countries did not retain a certain devotion to the land of their birth, but it is as cruel as it is unfair to twist this natural feeling into an excuse for malignant attacks upon their Americanism. In this moment of mean suspicion, it is well to remember that it was the foreign-born who rallied most enthusiastically at Lincoln's call and that the adopted sons of the United States played as fine a part in the preservation of the Union as did the native-born.

As a consequence of the excitement that sweeps the country, we are witnessing a disposition to place opportunism above principle. Is it not possible that policies of lasting effect may be framed with larger regard for expediency than for the future permanence of democratic institutions? In such an hour, Abraham Lincoln is at once a guide and an inspiration.

Only the God who heard his midnight prayers will ever know the full extent of the trials and agonies that Lincoln was called upon to bear. Slandered, vilified and outrageously attacked by warring factions of the North that accused him of tyranny on the one hand and weak sentimentality on the other; with the great powers of Europe ready to take advantage of American weakness, the head of a nation rent by every imaginable fear and prejudice and hatred, he remained true to the ancient faith, his eyes remained fixed upon the far goals of truth and justice.

Our need to-day is of men of courage, sufficient to rise above the clamors of passion and prejudice, as Lincoln rose; to hold the honor of America safe against the world, as Lincoln held it; to make clear the faith of the United States in liberty, equality and justice, as Lincoln made it clear, and to stand as a beacon, even as Lincoln stood, flashing the light of a steadfast purpose.

As every sane citizen must be, I am for preparedness, of course — a preparedness that shall be thorough and adequate. In the light of events, I realize keenly that we must place much greater emphasis on naval and military affairs, for the day is not yet come when we can rely upon love of peace and real justice to guard us from aggression or invasion.

It is idle to talk of peace in terms of non-resistance. Passions

have been loosed that will threaten for years to come, and in the troubled future that stretches out before us, the sanest pacifism is such preparedness as will inspire possible aggressors with a real respect and genuine caution.

I do not know what to-morrow holds in store for us, but I do know that in the progress and permanence of this great adventure in democracy is contained the hope of all the peoples of all the earth. We are false to ourselves, false to our traditions, false to the men who made the Nation great, false to all the people of the earth, if we do not keep the faith, so that in the day of reckoning and adjustment there may be standards to which all can repair. In addition to increasing the army and strengthening the navy and our coast defenses, the growing youth, one million of whom come into man's estate every year, must be given strength, courage and instruction that will fit them to take arms effectively in the day of their country's danger. We must come to the realization that what the Nation demands of one must be demanded of all and that responsibilities of patriotism rest with equal weight upon rich and poor; upon high and low.

The Swiss or Australian system, modified to suit American needs, is the one true preparedness that will not disrupt industry nor turn the United States into an armed camp or burden the taxpayers with still heavier loads. Best of all, it is a preparedness that places all emphasis upon defense and not upon offense, fostering our devotion to peace, even while it affords protection. Even while admitting the need of a larger preparedness, however, I do not feel that our present lack of it calls for the hysteria that sees or imagines that it sees an armed foe behind every bush and tree or the unworthy exaggerations that would belittle the inspiring glories of the past.

It is not true that we occupy our proud position as a world power by grace of chance and miracles. If America is great, it is because Americans have thought and labored greatly, ever advancing the frontiers of invention, science and industry, ever able to draw upon deep reserves of strength in crisis and in emergency. If we have prospered, it has not been at the expense of spiritual values, and the sneer of "dollar diplomacy" comes with poor grace from countries whose every war has been a war fought by the aggressor at least for gain and for aggrandizement, while every war our country has waged has been fought for some deathless principle.

It was the attempt of some to impose their standards of values upon the United States in the time of Lincoln and not the least

of his great services was the re-affirmation of the Americanism for which the ragged Colonials suffered and died. To-day, as then, this same attempt is being made, and we are asked to be ashamed that we have placed emphasis upon the arts of peace rather than the spoils of war.

It should still be our pride that we are a great commercial nation and not a military power. Industry builds up and war tears down — industry makes for co-operation and friendship, war for hate and isolation — industry brings out all that is best in a people and war, notwithstanding the examples of splendid heroism and noble self-sacrifice, with which its annals are filled, appeals to the most ignoble passions and brings out the worst in human nature. War sets back the race, industry carries it forward. Finer than any achievement in arms are the industrial achievements that have sent the machinery of civilization to the far corners of the earth and the progress and science that has enabled those trained in American schools and universities to minister to the sick and to the suffering of the world.

Let others boast of their triumphs of destruction — our pride shall be in building.

It is America that has spanned streams, tunneled the mountains, made the deserts to bloom and blossom as the rose and carried civilization to dark and hopeless places. Such was the dream of Abraham Lincoln. At a time when the North rang to the shouts of victory, his whole soul was devoted to plans of pacification that should quickly heal the wounds of war and place again the feet of a reunited people in the paths of peaceful progress.

To hold to our ideals is an obligation laid upon us by every sacred tradition.

Great is the duty of America and great its tasks and infinitely great its opportunity, and on this day, associated as it is with the greatest name in all our history, it is well that we should renew our faith and our devotion, striving ever more earnestly to reach those heights of love and idealism, of fraternity and justice and passionate Americanism, where Abraham Lincoln lived and labored.

Speech of Jacob Gould Schurman

The great war has for the last year and a half overshadowed every other interest on this planet. There has been no war like it in the entire history of the human race. All the continents of the globe are involved — Europe, Asia, Australia, and even North America, and, excepting the United States, all the great nations are among the belligerents.

This colossal war creates great problems for us while it lasts, and is destined to create still greater problems when peace brings a new adjustment of relations between the present belligerents. So far as America is concerned, however, I look forward to the future with very great confidence. I will say at once that long before the war broke out I favored a reasonable enlargement of our army and navy. And I still advocate that policy. I do not think, however, that the war has increased or, in the end, will increase the dangers of attack on America. During the continuance of the present war no European power could think of despatching its army and navy across the ocean to make war on America. And, when peace is established, the necessity of maintaining a military equilibrium in Europe will render it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for any great power to throw any considerable portion of its military and naval forces outside the European theater. Neither at present nor prospectively, therefore, has the war magnified the perils of the United States from the side of Europe.

It may be said, however, that there is another great power outside Europe, of which I have not taken account. Let me, therefore, remark at once that I have by no means forgotten Japan. Indeed, it looks to me as though the gains from this great European war might accrue very largely to Japan, while the losses will fall on the European belligerents. Japan has driven Germany out of Asia and taken possession of the strongly fortified naval and commercial base which Germany had established at Kiao-Chau, and thus secured for herself a new point of departure for the political and commercial, and, perhaps, even the military leadership which she has resolved to establish in China. It is no doubt the fixed policy of Japan to dominate the far east and, if possible, to dominate it alone. Victorious over China in war, she has steadily worked to prevent other great powers entrenching themselves there. Single-handed, she forced Russia back in

1905 and gained for herself Port Arthur and the Liao-Tung Peninsula, while in 1910 she annexed the formerly independent state of Korea. And of the other great powers of Europe, Austria and Italy have never possessed a foothold in China, so that Japan's sole supremacy is disputed only by England at Hong Kong and by France at Tongkin.

But even if we recognize the magnification of Japanese power in the Orient as a result of the European war, and even if we assume that Japan will in the future get the largest share of the trade and the commercial concessions of China, and exercise a controlling influence with the Chinese Government, and in virtue of her unique position and power realize her ambition to become the leader of all Asia, I want to emphasize the fact that this entire programme, whether it be regarded as practical or fantastic, has no element in it of conflict with America provided only the door is left open in China to American trade; and, if this door is closed, it would not only be America but all the nations of the world which would protest against such commercial exclusiveness.

I cannot see, therefore, that the war, either in its course or in its results, is likely to bring any new dangers to the United States. But, while the war has not menaced, and is not likely to menace, our security, it has demonstrated, by its vast operations and its titanic exhibitions of force, the utter inadequacy of the American army and navy for the purpose of national defense. So long as we have military and naval forces they should be equal to the functions for which we have created them. That purpose is the defense of the republic against attack by any foreign nation or nations. The present war has demonstrated that the means and instruments of attack have been multiplied and magnified beyond the resources of our army and navy. The problem, therefore, which the war has put upon us is the bringing of our agencies of national defense up to the modern standard.

I am not among those who think we should provide against every conceivable possibility of attack. The most we can do, if we are not to become at the same time both militarists and bankrupts, is to provide against reasonable probabilities of attack. The one standing danger is the possibility of a dispute with any nation which diplomacy fails to adjust. But in dealing with nations with our own ideals and our own standards of civilization it is the duty of diplomats to be infinitely hopeful and patient, and, if in the end diplomacy fails, resort should always be had to arbitration.

Owing to substantial agreement in ideals and civilization it ought to be possible for us to settle in this war all disputes with

the great nations of Europe, and I mention in particular England, France and Germany, since these are the only nations with large navies, and only naval powers could, of course, attack the United States. Some years since it was officially declared by the British Government that in making their military and naval plans they took no account of the United States, because they assumed that war between Great Britain and the United States was henceforth impossible. I think this sentiment is reciprocated in our country, for the majority of our people are of British descent and we recognize the number and force of the social, commercial, and other ties by which the two peoples are united together. A little reflection I believe will also convince us, and for the same reasons, of the practical impossibility of war between the United States and Germany. The millions of people in this country of German descent are constantly interpreting the two nations to one another and mediating between them, so that the bare thought of war suggests something fratricidal and abhorrent. I need not dwell on our sister republic of France, for, with the exception of Napoleon's incursion into Mexico, nothing has happened since the foundation of our republic to disturb the cordial relations between the two nations or to suggest that the unbroken peace which has always subsisted between them should not continue for the indefinite future.

As I look into the future I think the main problems not only of America, but of the world, are likely to come from the Orient. More than half the human race—more than nine hundred millions out of sixteen hundred millions—dwell in Asia, and of these over four hundred millions are in China alone. The great economic event of the near future will be the opening up of China with its extensive territories, its vast undeveloped resources, its teeming, intelligent and highly capable population. As I have already said, it is the ambition of Japan, which has already challenged and defeated European advances, to preside over this development. Whether it is brought about through the agency of Japan alone or with the co-operation of European powers, it is likely to have momentous results, not only in the economic field, but also in the political and social. The Government of China may be shaken, but Americans will certainly hope that this great people may retain their national independence. In any event, it seems safe to predict that the superabundant population of China and Japan will spread beyond the mainland and overflow into the islands of the Pacific and the continent of Australasia. Then will emerge in acute form the rivalry between

the white and yellow races, with their conflicting civilizations, religions, and social and moral standards. And this world rivalry will first touch the white race in any large way in North and South America.

Of course no one can foresee the future. The most we can do is to take account of past and present tendencies and endeavor to forecast their future developments. It is guess work at best. But there is a difference between guess work based on probabilities and guess work without any basis at all. And so when I am asked why we need to increase our army and navy I say it is to protect us against such probable dangers as I have indicated in the general world situation and also against such unpredictable explosions as might occur at any time in the course of a great war like that which is now convulsing the civilized world.

The pacifist would have no army or navy at all. The militarist would have a vast army and the strongest navy in the world. I am neither a pacifist nor a militarist. If we lived in Utopia I should be a pacifist. But we live on this half-civilized earth, and the majority of its inhabitants are to-day at war with one another. Nations are dragged into the conflict against their will. America, now as always, loves peace and is devoted to peaceful pursuits. But the nations of Europe and Asia — to say nothing of Mexico — may at any time, now or later, force us to defend the honor of America and the lives and the rights of Americans. In this rude world neither innocence nor justice nor any moral or spiritual perfection will guarantee a nation against attack.

The pacifist's ideals are so high that they can be realized only in celestial spheres. On this terrestrial globe even the most enlightened and civilized nations must provide for themselves means of defense against the aggressions of other nations who covet their wealth or territory, oppose their national policies, or violate their just rights. This inexorable necessity of self-defense America cannot escape. Like other nations, she must protect herself. Heaven grant she may always be able to resist aggressions! She certainly will never be the aggressor. I think the spirit of America is happily described by the apostle: "God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind."

I rejoice in President Wilson's conversion to the cause of preparedness. Better late than never.

But the conversion of our chief magistrate at this late date is apt to create a false impression of the condition of our foreign affairs. The President does well, therefore, to declare and reiter-

ate that nothing new has happened to disturb our relations with any of the nations of the world, whether neutral or belligerent. True, the President assures us that he does not know what a day may bring forth; but ignorance of the future, though a handicap to statesmanship, is not a ground for alarm.

Yet the President is apprehensive that the peace of the Republic may be disturbed. His fear is that our foreign relations may come to such a pass that it will be impossible for him to maintain peace and at the same time vindicate the national honor. But since nothing new has happened in our foreign affairs, this can only mean that the President is beginning to despair of diplomatic success in settling the questions that had hitherto been raised with the belligerent nations. And with the failure of diplomacy his mind, which as he himself has told us, is a "one-track" mind, begins to contemplate the alternative of force with the possible embroilment of America in this conflict of European nations over European issues.

Well, of one thing we may be assured. If, under the leadership of President Wilson, the United States is brought into the war, all Americans will loyally rally to the flag, whatever their party, whatever their ancestral blood, whatever their natal soil. We may differ in sentiments as in origins, but all differences are merged in devotion to America and loyalty to the flag; and against the rest of the world we are one and indivisible, a vast and united army of patriots ready to fight and to die for the defense of the Nation's rights and the maintenance of the Nation's honor.

But why do we talk of war? Why does President Wilson, after playing pacifist so long, affright our ears with this dreadful warning? There is no new infringement of American rights, no new attack on American honor, no new destruction of American life. These outrages we have suffered for a year or more — not spasmodically, but continuously; not locally, but over a vast theater, extending from Mexico to the North Sea — and the President has met them by diplomatic notes and found in them no arguments for preparedness.

The time to have begun preparations for the national defense was in 1914, when this world-war started. Then, as now, no one could tell what a day would bring forth. Then, as now, Europe was in conflagration and sparks might drop on tinder in America. Then, as now, it was obvious that it might be impossible for the American Government to preserve peace and at the same time maintain the national honor. Then, as now, every argument which the President is using in favor of preparedness was per-

tinent and sound. But then the President was opposed to preparedness.

Had the President in 1914 recommended to Congress an increase in our army and navy and other suitable measures of national defense, and had Congress enacted the recommendations into law, there would have been something besides papers and ink behind the diplomatic arm of our Government. And can anyone who knows how the business of governments is carried on doubt that, under these circumstances, belligerents would have hesitated to violate American rights, to destroy American life, and to set at naught the rules of international law and the dictates of conscience and humanity? I have no doubt that had the President advocated preparedness in 1914, as he is doing in 1916, the most serious international difficulties which now confront our Government would never have arisen.

Though I recognize force as an instrumentality in the conduct of international relations, it is something to be kept in reserve. It is the last thing to be used and it is to be used only in the utmost emergency, and then only when it can be justified by the good sense and conscience of the Nation. In my view there are three factors governing success in the conduct of international affairs. Of these the last is force. The first and most important of all is to have a just cause. Without right and reason behind it, no policy can or ought to prevail. And given a just cause, the next condition of success in the maintenance of international relations is a consistent and vigorous diplomacy. A weak, vacillating, shift and undignified diplomacy will ruin the most righteous cause.

Take the case of Mexico. Here undoubtedly we had a just cause if ever a nation had one. I will not recite any of the circumstances of the killing of American men, the assaulting of American women, the starving of American children, and the wanton destruction of American property in Mexico. But our Government pursued a weak, inconsistent, and fantastic diplomacy. President Wilson seems to have been animated by a personal dislike of Huerta, whom the other great nations had recognized as the head of the Mexican State. I will not recall the flag incident, or the acts of war committed in Vera Cruz, or the recall of our navy without securing the salute for which President Wilson had sent it to Mexico. In all this business the President seems to have been misled by his dislike of Huerta and his dominating passion "for the submerged 85 per cent" of Mexicans whom he supposed Huerta to be oppressing. His great ambition was to

compose the differences which had arisen between Mexicans and to aid in establishing a new order, "which will have its foundation on human liberty and human rights."

Now it is not only a fundamental doctrine of international law, but the foundation of democracy, that every people shall establish that form of government which seems to them best. It is not for any outside nation, however great or free or prosperous, to dictate to other nations what political institutions they shall adopt or what persons they shall elect to the highest offices. Naturally, the people of Mexico resented the meddling of President Wilson with their own affairs. President Wilson's attack on Huerta made Huerta the champion of Mexico's sovereignty and a national hero. From beginning to end the President's Mexican policy has been a failure. And he himself confesses as much in his last message to Congress, when he says: "Whether we have benefited Mexico by the course we have pursued remains to be seen."

There are two policies, either of which might have been adopted in our dealings with Mexico. We might have held entirely aloof, leaving it to the Mexican people themselves to settle their own troubles. This is the policy of non-intervention. On the other hand, we might have intervened on the ground that Mexico had demonstrated her incapacity to fulfill her international obligations. President Wilson has adopted neither one policy nor the other. He has followed both, sometimes together and at other times successively. What the end will be no one knows. Mr. Manuel Calero, former Mexican Secretary of Foreign Affairs and former Mexican Ambassador to the United States, declares that the recognition of Carranza was "a recognition as a de facto government of something that is de facto disorganization and anarchy."

I have been speaking of diplomacy and military preparedness. These subjects are forced upon our attention and consideration by the great war. But this year or later the war will end. And the hundreds of millions of human beings whose first concern is now of war will return to peaceful industry. All the belligerent nations will find themselves burdened with colossal and overwhelming debts. In all there will be a great shortage of capital, both fixed and circulating, for the upbuilding of agriculture, manufacturing, transportation, and other forms of peaceful industry. Necessity, however, will be laid upon them all to swell the volume of their exports and to diminish their imports as a condition of meeting their national financial obligations. The most highly or-

ganized governments among them may not improbably, organize systems of exportation under state control. Even before the war, some of them exercised a unique control over their entire commercial system and mobilized it with something like military discipline. Undoubtedly this will continue in still greater degree after the war is over. This will be one advantage to offset the many disadvantages under which the belligerent nations must resume their normal industrial life. And there is another advantage which must not be overlooked. Whatever the horrors and atrocities of war, all experience shows that war is of tremendous potency in developing the energies of a people. With the coming of peace, therefore, we may expect to see in the populations of the belligerent countries a self-denial, a thrift, an industry, and in general, a productive capacity surpassing anything that our generation has ever before witnessed.

As I have already said, I wish that President Wilson had grappled with the question of military preparedness immediately upon the outbreak of the war. At any rate, now that the war has lasted a year and a half, and the exhaustion of men, money and munitions is so tremendous that it is possible to predict its termination within some calculable limit of months or seasons, it is high time to consider the problem of industrial preparedness which will have to be solved as soon as peace is re-established in the world. We are already too late in making a beginning. In the midst of their war, European nations have been grappling with it. The central powers of Europe have held a conference at Vienna, which, though secret, is known to have dealt with this subject. Less than a month ago it was the subject of a debate in the British House of Commons. In that debate the President of the Board of Trade explained to the House what the government had already done for the development in Great Britain of industries like chemicals, dyes, optical glass, and electric apparatus, which, at the outbreak of the war, were almost entirely in enemy hands. Although free trade is almost a religion in England, he explained that the Government had used national funds to assist British companies in the establishment of some of these industries. Pre-suppositions on tariff questions were laid aside, everybody recognizing that economic and fiscal arrangements must be different after the war from what they were before the war. Whether with free trade or with protection it was declared that the British Empire must become an economically self-sufficient organization. In a matter so important, let me quote to you the exact words used by the President of the Board of Trade: "There should

be no essential article, either for the arts of peace or for the arts of war, upon which we cannot within the empire lay our hands."

As President Wilson has changed his mind on the subject of the increase of the army and navy, so he also has changed his mind on the proposal to establish a tariff commission. Such a commission was created in President Taft's time, and it rendered excellent service to the Government. When the Democrats came into power they abolished it. But public sentiment on this subject as on military preparedness has been expressing itself so clearly and emphatically that as I have said, President Wilson reverses his previous position. In itself this is a hopeful sign. The trouble, however, is that the President does not go far enough. This is not surprising, because the first words of the platform upon which President Wilson was elected are as follows: "We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government, under the constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purposes of revenue."

Free-trade though England is, her Government proposes that the British Empire shall now become industrially and economically self-sufficient. And all the belligerents are, when the war closes, likely to protect themselves by high tariffs against their competitors. While I personally am opposed to unreasonably high tariffs, I believe in protection so long as the nations generally do not adopt free trade. And at the close of this great world war less than ever can the United States afford to sacrifice her business interests to partisan theory. Before the war broke out, the tariff adopted by the Democratic party had already curtailed business and limited opportunities for employment. Our present prosperity, as everybody knows, is due almost wholly to our manufacture of munitions and sale of food and other supplies to the belligerents. This basis of prosperity is obviously only a temporary one. What is needed is to establish industrial preparedness so that, when the war is over, business will not only resume its normal course of development, but, under such reasonable protection as may be necessary for the purpose, expand by embracing new opportunities and utilizing more thoroughly the resources of the country, greatly to the advantage alike of manufacturers and workmen, traders and transporters and farmers and other producers, while enhancing at the same time the economic independence and industrial efficiency of the nation as an organized unit. The realization of this plan of industrial preparedness must be the work of the Republican party. The Democrats cannot ac-

comply with it. They are estopped alike by their creed, their traditions and their platform.

But our programme of industrial preparedness must include transportation as well as production. And the transportation business of the country is at the present time in a very bad way. It is suffering from a plethora of regulation, regulation not only by the Federal Government, but regulation by half a hundred States, both through the agency of Legislatures and Public Service Commissions. The result is a chaos of unnecessary, contradictory, and often unjust regulation. One State will deliberately make rates for the purpose of diverting business from points in other States to points within its own territories. A railroad, traversing several States, resolves, for sound reasons, to issue new securities; but the issue is blocked because one State refuses its sanction, though all the rest assent. The different States make different laws regarding hours of service for trainmen and size of crews. Some States even make it illegal for railroads to have their cars repaired outside their own boundaries. All kinds of reports are called for from the railroads by the different States and by the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington. And the State and Federal authorities frequently issue contradictory orders or authorizations.

It is impossible for the railroads to prosper under these conditions. The decline of railroad prosperity was manifest before the war broke out. Both the construction of new railroads and the development of existing railroads had fallen off. An increasing load of expenses reduced the balance of revenue available for additions and betterments. New capital was absolutely necessary if the railroad business was to be brought up to the requirements of the country. But the railroads under existing conditions did not appeal as objects of investment to prudent men with money to invest. Yet it is obvious that if the capital they need for improvement and expansion does not come to the railroads, not merely the roads themselves, but all the business of the country is bound to suffer.

The fact is that transportation has ceased to be a local or a State matter, and is now a great national concern. Supreme power over the railroads must ultimately be vested in the Federal Government. Perhaps this may be effected without an amendment of the Constitution, for in recent decisions of the Supreme Court the power of Congress where Interstate Commerce is affected has been affirmed as paramount. In some way or other the transportation business of the country must be brought under

Federal control, and the Democratic doctrine of States rights must not be allowed to stand in the way of this means of protecting and developing the nation's greatest industry.

Formerly American ships sailed on the seven seas. But nowadays it is rare to meet them outside our own waters. There is no other line of industry in which our present situation is so deplorable, and no defect is felt more keenly at the present time. European nations whose ships still sail the seas are monopolizing them largely for their own belligerent purposes. And the terminals of all our great railroads are piled high with commodities which there are no ships to carry abroad.

Our shipping laws impose so many burdens and restrictions on American ship owners that they have been driven almost completely out of business. The way to draw private capital to this industry is to enact new shipping laws which will protect it or at least give it an equal opportunity for profit with that enjoyed by capital in other domestic industries. We can never develop a merchant marine so long as our laws impose on the industry restrictions and burdens from which our foreign competitors are exempt. But as soon as we are ready to emancipate our shipping business from these obstacles, as soon as we are ready to give Americans the same chance to build and own ships which capitalists enjoy in foreign countries, we shall see the speedy development of a great American commercial marine.

I wish I could report that along with the other conversions he has undergone, President Wilson had been converted to the policy of giving free opportunity for the upbuilding of our merchant marine. Some sort of conversion he has indeed experienced in this matter. But he does not yet recognize that the shipping business must be a private industry. And he hovers nebulously on the margin of his old doctrine of Government ownership of merchant vessels. That doctrine, you will recall, he embodied last year in a bill which he submitted to Congress and which Congress wisely rejected. In the intervening twelve months the President has, as we have seen, reversed himself on the subject of national defense and also on the subject of a tariff commission. But though the administration shipping bill of to-day and that of a year ago are very different measures, it cannot be said that they are in complete contradiction to one another.

The new shipping bill is so obscure and ambiguous that it is almost impossible to grasp its meaning. It does not wholly abandon the policy of Government ownership and control of merchant vessels, but it sets out to accomplish its object by indirect meth-

ods. A ship is to be at one and the same time a naval auxiliary and a vessel of commerce; now it is the navy and now it is an independent merchantman. A man who invests his capital in it may think himself the owner to-day, but to-morrow he will discover that the ultimate ownership is in the Government. These are the self-contradictory agencies through which the President proposes to re-establish American shipping and special provision is made for the building and chartering, the buying, selling, and leasing of these mongrels of the sea, as well as making routes for them and fixing their rates of charge. This will certainly be a task of colossal difficulty. The administration bill assigns it to members of a shipping board, whose qualifications, however, it does not venture to specify.

President Wilson's original purpose was to put the Government of the United States into the ocean transportation business. The ships of the Government would compete with the ships of private owners. The present bill is in Darwinian phrase a mere rudimentary survival of the original measure. And like other rudimentary organs it serves no useful purpose. It should be thrown out by Congress. In spite of the obscurity of its terms, enough of it is intelligible to show that it is dangerous. What all thoughtful Americans desire is to see legislation enacted which will enable American business men following sound business methods to restore American merchantmen to the ocean and to secure for them their fair share of the carrying trade of the world. That result the proposed administration shipping bill will not and cannot accomplish.

So far I have been speaking of military and economic preparedness. I have been saying that if America is to develop her business and dwell in safety she must reorganize and adapt to modern conditions her plans of defense and her systems of production and transportation. When the war closes there will be a tremendous development of trade and commerce and financial exploitation, and America should lead the world. To-day she should be reorganizing her economic system and scientifically preparing for that high destiny.

But this success, even if we achieve it, will not exhaust either the duty or the opportunity of America. A nation is not merely an economic organism, still less is it a military machine. A nation is more than a physical entity. A nation is at the same time a moral personality. Its supreme ideal is justice. I have already said that the American nation is devoted to peace and industry.

I want now to add that the American nation also has a passion for justice.

Equal rights and equal laws America has already achieved. The equalization of opportunities and the fair adjustment of rewards to deserts and of burdens to abilities is the task to which the future beckons us. The demands of social justice are as inexorable as the demands of legal and political justice. And future reform and progress will consist largely of measures for the realization of this ideal. No political party, least of all the Republican party, can permanently endure unless it is a progressive party.

But the Nation is not an isolated moral personality. It is a member of the family of nations. And in this family America in the near future will have unparalleled opportunities for advancing international morality. The world is heartsick at the spectacle of immense devastation, wholesale slaughter and butchery, and heart-rending agony and suffering which war is piling up in Europe. When this horrible nightmare ends, the nations will be ready, as never before, to listen to proposals for permanent peace and disarmament, the arbitration of national disputes, and the establishment of an international court of justice. But peace, disarmament, arbitration, and a Supreme Court of justice are the most cherished ideals of America, for herself and for the world. The hour is striking for America to inaugurate a blessed revolution in the moral history of mankind.

Speech of Hon. Frederick M. Davenport

All men of good will feel alike and think alike in the presence of the spirit of Lincoln. And I suppose the reason is that when you are in the presence of the spirit of Lincoln, you are in the presence of the simple, deep universal qualities of human nature with respect to which all men are akin. I was born and reared and have always reckoned myself to be a Lincoln Republican. They used to rock babies to sleep when I was a little fellow, and my earliest recollection is of my father, who had been a soldier in the Civil War, crooning me off to slumber as he sang, "Tramp, Tramp, Tramp, the Boys Are Marching," "Cheer Up, Comrades, They Will Come," "Beneath the Starry Flag" and "They Shall Breathe the Air Again in the Freedom of Our Own Beloved Home." And I grew up to love the memory of the man who broke away from the decadent Whigs, that he might aid in establishing a party fearless to do right, fearless to declare that the Nation could not endure permanently half slave and half free, brave enough to recognize no North and no South, no black man and no white men, but only the union and justice and the human right to life and liberty and happiness of every soul beneath the flag.

And in spite of the short-comings and imperfections and even wrong doing that sooner or later beset every great party, composed as great parties necessarily are of more or less antagonistic groups and interests, the most practical channel in the United States to-day for the fulfillment of the purposes of Lincoln is still the party of Lincoln. What the United States needs just now is not a party in criticism, but a party in power, a party chastened by experience, a party whose Americanism is unquestioned and undoubted, which will protect at all cost the safety and the property of every American citizen who is himself within his rights and obligations, at home or abroad, in business or in peril, on sea or on land, with every last ounce of physical and mental and moral might of which the Nation is possessed. And I speak in this matter in a very broad sense, and apply the assertion of Americanism alike to the wrongful seizing of neutral cargoes and the rifling of national mail, as well as to the destruction of American life in Mexico and on the high seas. Firmness of purpose and a dauntless national spirit that cares for the welfare and prosperity of its own against the world, is the only sure basis not only

of peace and honor, but of self-respecting and lasting co-operation with other nations in the onward march of man.

Therefore it is a time for all men of good will, whether Republicans, Progressives or Independent Democrats, who desire the national welfare at home, and peace and honor abroad, to put aside the honest differences but now relatively unimportant antagonisms of other years, and stand shoulder to shoulder in the world crisis for a country without reproach and without shame. I count myself happy, therefore, for this and other reasons, to sit at the table of Lincoln with the Republican Governor of the Empire State. You know, Governor, there is sometimes much good to be gotten from a genuine revolutionist. There was George Washington; he is a good example. He settled down to be quite a stable and sensible person after his little controversy with George the Third. That is when he got peace with honor and that is the only kind any of us are after. Peace at any price is no peace at all. The only sure basis of peace is fairness and justice and a party and a government dedicated to the welfare of all. But seriously, I have watched the Governor since he has been in office with a great deal of concern, and with a great deal of sympathy. About the hardest job in America is the Governorship of the State of New York. A vast commonwealth, with conglomerate population and varied interests, with a great metropolis at the sea, and an inland empire stretching to the lakes, with a tradition of much misgovernment, with problems of grave and intricate import — altogether enough to try the stoutest heart and test the firmest will. I saw the incomparable Hughes almost beat his life and hope out against the obstacles which beset him in trying to carry out the theory that the people of the State desire the Governor of the State to be the leader of the State. And I have watched Governor Whitman as he has endeavored to assume the natural leadership in public affairs at Albany which his office and the wish of the people bid him assume. There is no question that the honesty and efficiency of Government, not yet in all departments, perhaps, but in most departments, is greatly improved since the Republican administration came back at Albany. There is no question that the personnel and policy of the Public Service Commissions, those vital organs of popular government, have been lifted to a higher plane. The new budget system of finance, suggested by the Governor in his recent message, is a proposal of the first order of importance if the commonwealth is not to pass through waste and extravagance to bankruptcy. I have observed the Governor's support of the movement

to make our prisons something more than hotbeds of the further degradation and debauchery of the inmates. And in this and other directions, I believe the Republican party has a great deal to build upon in the coming campaign. I for one have felt that I wanted to help in any way that I could. Sometimes destructive criticism is worth much—but not often, and not for long. I for one am anxious that the tradition of the Republican party, as a party fit to govern, should continue in unabated power. If there are still men among us who have the will and perhaps the purpose to impair that tradition, we who eat at the table of Lincoln are not those men. And in the commonwealth of New York, as well as in the country at large, I for one feel that it is time for a reunited Republicanism, for the centering of our efforts upon the preparation of the Nation for its long and difficult future.

Senator Davenport then took up the discussion of his topic, "The Man, Abraham Lincoln," and said in part:

Mr. Lincoln was pre-eminently the man of the people. The humblest knew him and loved him and this was one of the chief secrets of his power. An aged negro met him on the street and said with the tears streaming down his face as he bowed low his uncovered head: "God bless you, Massa Lincoln." Lincoln raised his hat and with a hearty "Thank you, sir," bowed and passed on.

Schuyler Colfax used to relate an incident of one of the dark days of 1863. It was on the evening of a public reception given at the White House. The foreign legations were there gathered about the President. A young English nobleman was just being presented to Lincoln. Inside the door, evidently overawed by the splendid assemblage, was an honest-faced old farmer, who shrank from the passing crowd until he and the plain-faced old lady clinging to his arm were pressed to the wall. The President, tall, and in a measure stately in his personal presence, looking over the heads of the assembly, said to the English nobleman: "Excuse me, my lord, there's an old friend of mine." Passing backward to the door, Mr. Lincoln said, as he grasped the old farmer's hand: "Why, John, I'm glad to see you. I haven't seen you since you and I split rails together in Sangamon County in '47. How are you?" The old man, turning to his wife with quivering lip and without replying to the President's salutation, said: "Mother, he's just the same old Abe."

"Mr. Lincoln," he said finally, "you know we had three boys;

they all enlisted in the same company. John was killed in the seven days' fight, Sam was taken prisoner and starved to death, and Henry is in the hospital. We had a little money an' I said, 'Mother, we'll go to Washington and see him.' An' while we were here I said we'll go up an' see the President."

Mr. Lincoln's eyes grew dim and across the rugged, homely, tender face there swept the wave of sadness his friends had learned to know, and he said: "John, we all hope this miserable war will soon be over. I must see all these folks here for an hour or so, and then I want to talk with you." And in the company of those two old souls that night Lincoln's happiness was complete.

And the deep humanity of the man gave him his hold upon the Nation. The god of nations knew that the old ship of state, in the crisis of her voyage, needed at the helm that wise, strong, tender hand. No wonder that Stanton said of him, as he gazed upon the tall form and the kindly face, as he lay there smitten with the assassin's bullet: "There lies the most perfect ruler of men that ever lived."

His trust in the people was supreme. His genius consisted in grasping in his thought the best public opinion, as it was asserting itself among the masses of his countrymen, and then in following that opinion, so that he seemed to be the leader of it.

He was not a radical, a mountain-top prophet like Wendell Phillips, the brave scout ahead of the army. He was the commander of the forces in the plain; he moved in the line in which he could secure the full loyalty of his men, and never marched too slowly and never moved too rapidly.

But with his secretaries and generals he was a masterful man when he saw the necessity. Singularly gentle, but tremendously self-reliant.

Said Stanton to him one day: "Mr. Lincoln, I cannot carry out that order; it is improper and I do not believe it is right." Speaking very gently, Lincoln said: "Well, I reckon, Mr. Secretary, that you will have to carry it out." "But I won't do it, Mr. President, it is all wrong." "I guess you will have to do it, Mr. Secretary." And it was done.

Master, but gentle. He might have said with the psalmist: "Thy gentleness hath made me great."

There was in him a silent consciousness of power; courage to follow to the end the right as God gave him to see the right. And this will serve to explain his mastership in great crises.

The day came when Lincoln for the first time presented the

emancipation proclamation to his cabinet, and was about to take the most important step ever taken by a President of the United States. And the supremacy of his character was shown in that hour when he told Seward and Chase and Stanton and them all, that on the main question of the issuance of the proclamation, there could be no discussion; he had settled that for himself.

That was not egotism of character; it was the firmness and courage of principle and conscience, buttressed by Almighty God, for he said to his cabinet that day, and Chase has preserved it in his diary — that he had promised the ruler of nations that if the rebel army should be driven out of Maryland, and the time should thus be ripe for it, the stroke of his pen should set four millions free. Masterful, because he relied on Almighty God.

For assuredly as there is a God, Abraham Lincoln was God's child. Of that there can be no doubt. Thoughtless and even skeptical though he was in his early years concerning the great questions of God and eternity, it is possible of proof beyond all peradventure, that as the burdens of life weighed upon him, under the pressure of four years of responsibility, such as the world never witnessed before, he crept up close to the Almighty and listened for his word of command. In the great moments of the Civil War he was alone with God. All the battles he took to the throne — every important movement of that mighty history with which he is connected — and Almighty God guided him into an experience of trustfulness such as has been vouchsafed to few men in all the centuries. With Lincoln it was God's cause, God's work, and he was God's man. There are many striking illustrations and convincing proofs of his faith and reliance upon the Almighty. Here is one from the lips of Gen. James F. Rusling of New Jersey. In the third day's fight at Gettysburg, Daniel E. Sickles was wounded, conveyed to Washington and placed in a building opposite the Ebbit House. General Rusling, who knew Sickles well, called to see him. While there, President Lincoln was announced, and he was shown into the room. The three men fell into conversation about the battle. Sickles asked Lincoln if he hadn't been greatly worried about the result of the fight. "Oh, no," said Mr. Lincoln, "I thought it would be all right." "But you must have been the only man who felt so," replied Sickles, "for I understand there was deep anxiety here among the heads of the Government." "Yes," replied the President, "Stanton, Wells and the rest were pretty badly frightened and ordered two or three gunboats to the city, and placed some

of the Government archives aboard, and wanted me to go, but I told them it wasn't necessary, that it would be all right."

"What made you feel so confident, Mr. President?" persisted General Sickles. "Oh, I had my reasons, but I don't care to mention them, for they would perhaps be laughed at," said Lincoln. But Sickles pressed him and Lincoln said, "Well, I will tell you why I felt confident we should win at Gettysburg. Before the battle I retired alone to my room in the White House, and got down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God to give us the victory. I said to Him that this was His war, and that if He would stand by the Nation now, I would stand by Him the rest of my life. He gave us the victory, and I propose to keep my pledge."

It is not too much to say that no man has lived in the history of this nation who could in a larger sense or with more appropriateness be called a prophet of God. What was the characteristic of the Old Testament prophet. He lived close to God and heard God's voice and knew God's will, and spoke God's word better than any other man of his time. That was Lincoln, too. Many a man said of him — as was said of the man of Nazareth — how knoweth this man letters, having never learned? How comes it that with no particular technical mental training, he should develop such honesty of purpose, such strong common sense, such clear reasoning powers, such singular capacity for reading and leading the popular mind, such preeminence over his fellows? Almighty God put the root of these things into him at birth, and because Abraham Lincoln was true to the leadings of Providence, these qualities developed into flower and the fruit. By the hand of the Great Father he was singled out to guide our Government, to put down a rebellion, to give freedom to a race. There are people who still think that in 1860 the Republican party, and in fact the whole country, fastened spontaneously and simultaneously on Lincoln as the one man fit to lead the nation along the path of peril, but that is a bubble of fancy very easy to burst. In the convention fight of 1860, Seward of New York was the most formidable candidate, and Lincoln was the dark horse who was backed with the cry — anything to beat Seward. Up to this time, Lincoln was not famous, he was available, that is all. And why available? So far as the human eye of the president makers could see, it was because he was a new and comparatively unknown man, and he was therefore more likely to be a successful candidate. Wendell Phillips cried out: "Who

is this hickster in politics, who is this county court advocate?" The southern people thought when he came to Washington that he would turn out to be a clod-hopper with the smell of the barn-yard upon him, but they were sadly mistaken. The Republican party, the country, didn't know the prize they had got. Only Almighty God knew.

71.2009.084.05114

